

### **REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

The Office Action of December 15, 2008, has been reviewed and the following remarks are responsive thereto. Claims 60-90 have been added. No new matter has been added. Claims 21-59 have been cancelled or were previously cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer. Claims 60-90 are pending upon entry of the present amendment. Reconsideration and allowance of the instant application is respectfully requested.

#### ***Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)***

Claims 21-26, 29-32, 35-37, 41-50 and 55-59 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Piosenka *et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 5,926,756, “Piosenka”) in view of Shanahan (U.S. Patent No. 7,149,509, “Shanahan”) and Dahm *et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 6,301,471, “Dahm”). Claims 51-54 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Shanahan in view of Piosenka. These rejections are respectfully traversed.

Claims 21-26, 29-32, 35-37, 41-50 and 51-59 have been cancelled, thus rendering these rejections moot.

#### ***New Claims***

Claims 60-90 have been added. No new matter has been added. Support for the claimed features may be found throughout the originally filed specification.

Claim 60 recites, *inter alia*, “receiving, at a computing device, a user selection of personalized information to transfer from the first mobile communication device to the computing device, wherein the personalized information includes at least one of: settings of the first mobile communication device, a calendar, a phonebook and a message and wherein the selection is received prior to initiating transfer of the personalized information; and receiving, at the computing device, the personalized information transferred from a memory of the first mobile communication device to a memory of the computing device.” Nowhere do any of the cited references teach or suggest such features. For example, Piosenka, Shanahan and Dahm all fail to teach or suggest, either separately or in combination, receiving a user selection of personalized information to transfer from a first mobile communication device to the computing device, wherein the selection is received prior to initiating transfer of the personalized

information. Piosenka describes a system where phone settings may be programmed from a computing device such as a PC 14. *See, e.g.*, Col. 6, ll. 16-29. While Piosenka states that the software can also interrogate the cellular telephone to determine the current state of all programmable features (Col. 6, ll. 48-52), Piosenka does not teach or suggest receiving a user selection of the programmable features to transfer from the first mobile communication device to the computing device prior to initiating the transfer, as recited in claim 60. Indeed, Piosenka describes the determination of a state of **all** programmable features, rendering user selection prior to initiating the transfer or interrogation unnecessary. Shanahan and Dahm fail to cure these deficiencies of Piosenka. Accordingly, claim 60 is allowable for at least these reasons.

Claims 68 and 74 recite features similar to those discussed above with respect to claim 60 and are thus allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 60.

Claims 61-67, 69-73 and 75-77 are dependent on claims 60, 68 and 74, respectively, and are thus allowable for at least the same reasons as their respective base claim.

Claim 83 recites, *inter alia*, “receive a request to write previously stored personalized information stored at the apparatus to a mobile communication device...[and] receive a selection of the previously personalized information from the plurality of previously stored personalized information.” Piosenka and Shanahan also fail to teach or suggest these features. For example, nowhere does Piosenka teach or suggest receiving a request to write personalized information *previously stored* at an apparatus to a mobile communication device. FIG. 6 of Piosenka illustrates a screen shot of a graphical interface for programming phonebook data in a cellular telephone. Col. 8, ll. 60-62. In particular, Piosenka states that if a name and number is desired to be added to the phonebook, the user simply enters the name of the person and corresponding telephone number. Col. 8, ll. 62-66. Accordingly, the user must enter the data to be transferred contemporaneously, i.e., the data to be transferred is not ***previously stored*** at the apparatus, as recited in claim 82. Shanahan and Dahm are similarly deficient. Claim 82 is thus allowable for at least these reasons.

Claims 78 and 87 recite feature similar to those discussed above with respect to claim 83 and are thus allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 83.

Claims 79-82, 84-86 and 88-90 are dependent on claims 78, 83 and 87, respectively, and are thus allowable for at least the same reasons as their respective base claim.

Appln. No.: 09/788,493  
Amendment dated March 11, 2009  
Reply to final Office Action of December 15, 2008

**CONCLUSION**

All rejections having been addressed, Applicants respectfully submits that the instant application is in condition for allowance, and respectfully solicits prompt notification of the same. However, if for any reason the Examiner believes the application is not in condition for allowance or there are any questions, the Examiner is requested to contact the undersigned at (202) 824-3156.

Respectfully submitted,

BANNER & WITCOFF, LTD.

Dated: March 11, 2009

By:           /Chunhsi Andy Mu/            
Chunhsi Andy Mu  
Registration No. 58,216

1100 13th Street, N.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20005  
Tel: (202) 824-3000  
Fax: (202) 824-3001